

## SCHLEY-HODGSON LETTERS.

## UNPRECEDENTED SITUATION TO BE PASSED UPON AT WASHINGTON.

The United States Navy to Have a Lesson in Personal Honor or Dishonor, or in Faithfulness, or Unfaithfulness, to a Brother Officer—A Tragic Story.

WASHINGTON, Oct. 10.—Since the beginning of the Schley inquiry the Schley press has been a marvel and indeed an innovation as reporters of the news. The Sun of Monday last gave some illustrations of the methods of suppressing the testimony unfavorable to its favorite and of giving a false aspect to the testimony that it permitted to pass. During the last week this practice has been even magnified, particularly in connection with the Schley-Hodgson correspondence and the testimony concerning it. The letters have not been printed in the Schley reports, and Hodgson's testimony has been so little better, possibly a little better, for it has been to be expected that the Schley side of the case was all the stronger because of Hodgson's appearance on the stand.

The Schley-Hodgson correspondence is something novel in naval records. Past history reveals no action on the part of any officer like that which this correspondence reveals of Schley toward both the public and a brother officer. As the correspondence is a vital element in the case in question, and as it involves a peculiar standard of personal conduct, the Court's approval of that standard as tolerable in the navy, or condemnation of it as intolerable, is bound to figure prominently in the final opinion. Consequently the decision is awaited with the greatest interest by the navy and its more immediate friends.

To tell how the correspondence arose, it will be well to start with the situation described by Hodgson in his first letter to Schley, dated June 8, 1898, at Washington, D. C. "I am writing you," he wrote, "after the surrender of Santiago, and when most of the fleet was gathered there, two of the ships were practically abandoned to find a sinister whisper going around the fleet to the effect that the Brooklyn took care to keep at a safe distance from the Spanish fleet. The reason why we were accused of being at a safe distance was that I thought to be a true explanation of the situation." The explanation was first made public by the Sun's putting into type the form of it that came to THE SUN. It was printed merely as a correspondence, and it is not true. The report was that at the time of the Brooklyn's last conversation took place on her.

Schley—Put your letter in the paper. Hodgson—You mean the paper? Schley—No, I don't. We are near enough to them. Hodgson—But will it not do the Texas? Schley—Let the Texas look out for herself.

This was not published in connection with the former correspondence, but in connection with Admiral Schley's statement to the Senate that he had made the turn in to avoid "blanketing" the American fleet. The report was that the day that there was ample room for the Brooklyn to turn with the starboard beam instead of with the port beam without blanketing the American fleet, that was not the point. The colloquy was printed manifestly and solely as evidence bearing upon the merit of the aforesaid statement by Admiral Schley.

It should be said here in passing that repetitions of it varied in text, showing that verbal accuracy was never regarded as essential, and there was absolutely no rational ground for imagining that it was "intended to promote the notion that you and I had a controversy at a critical time," as Schley subsequently argued with Hodgson. Neither was there emphasis upon the inherent suggestion of cowardice.

Schley's situation, then, was that of an officer whose official report had been challenged as to its veracity.

This colloquy was repeated in many newspapers without denial by Schley himself, although the latter was practically making speeches on the Santiago fight. The third publication of it in THE SUN gave Hodgson as the authority, and then the correspondence began, which the public with some few impatient exceptions.

(Personal.) WASHINGTON, D. C., June 8, 1898. DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: I send you an extract of THE NEW YORK SUN, and would ask you to write me your denial of this extract. I know full well that you never made any such statement of this character, but I am sure that you will not let the country as well as myself. This is a serious and malignant violation of duty to cease, and in justice to you and to myself I think something authoritative ought to be said. Very respectfully, W. S. SCHLEY.

It is to be noticed that there is little sign in this letter of the indignation that would be looked for in an officer practically accused of falsehood. The avowed purpose of it was not at all to vindicate the man who was accused, but to vindicate Hodgson, and, according to the letter, to vindicate the party primarily aggrieved. "I desire to place you in a proper light," wrote Schley. The representation should cease, "first, in justice to you."

Hodgson's answer was, briefly, that he could not send a "denial of this extract," for, so far from being a "grotesque lie," it was a true statement, "substantially correct." In his letter there is apparent an inferior mental precision and a moral fervor, but the tone of the case affecting Schley and Hodgson, the letters show, were never confused in Hodgson's mind, nor from his point of view were the assertions of them contradictory. He wrote:

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: ... What THE SUN has printed as part of the conversation between you and me is substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made. He described how, when he heard Schley say "port," he hurried to him with the suggestion that the Texas was in the direction where a port beam would carry the Brooklyn. He told him that he had authorized the use of his name in THE SUN, that "to the best of my recollection, THE SUN's report of the colloquy was substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made."

Here Schley argues that the colloquy could not have been true because Hodgson could not have been an officer and too glib a man to have committed the impropriety of it. He published the first letter of June 11 without the paragraph about the newspaper clipping, which indicated that the denial, instead of being spontaneous, was in response to a request. Hodgson's subsequent statements in his letters and on the witness stand. They showed that he thought he was asked to deny the "verbal accuracy" of the "colloquy as printed," and that, as he admitted on the witness stand, his "denial" was "qualitative."

Now Schley's position is that of a man who feeling himself to be under a serious accusation asks his friend to make a statement to the effect that he is not guilty, but his friend says the charge is substantially true, and refuses to make such a statement. But Schley neither denounces Hodgson for retaining the "qualitative" complaint of not venturing to deny the report himself. Neither did he abandon his efforts on the man he wanted for a witness. He stuck to Hodgson, not with indignation but with argument and renewed protestations of friendship. He wrote:

That should be denied. I have no recollection whatever of anything of the kind and my memory is exceedingly clear of the events of that day.

Cook really gave the order which I approved and I intended that you conveyed it with him, but THE SUN's effort has been to promote the notion that you and I had a controversy at a critical moment and this is unjust to you and to me. "What I desire to state is that I do not recall any such colloquy occurred and I will see that proper correction is made to guard you from this slander."

There is much in your letter that I should not like to state as it would involve assault upon you which I am unwilling should happen, and what I want to show is simply that this dialogue did not occur and that the whole thing is a mere fabrication. I want to give the least trouble possible to you at a time when I know you are much worried over the recent grounding, and which I know was no fault of yours, and I do not want to add to your worry. I will see that proper correction is made to guard you from this slander."

Again his first anxiety is for his friend. "I do not feel in the least disturbed by this attack," but "I do feel for yourself."

It is this "but I feel for yourself" which is the key to the whole thing. Hodgson it was which forbade him to use the letter refusing his first request. "There is much in your letter that I should not like to state as it would involve assault upon you which I am unwilling should happen."

Schley wrote, "It is this dialogue that should be denied." What I want to show is simply that this dialogue did not occur. "Make your letter as short as possible."

"Don't you return the enclosed slip with your reply?"

"I am hoping referred to in this letter was not an 'editorial' from THE SUN," as the first one was, but it was this selected argument in support of Schley's request in the enclosed letter that came to THE SUN.

THE ALLEGED COLLOQUY ON THE BROOKLYN. EDITORIAL: I admit your intrepid editorial treatment of what you justly determine to be a letter of a brother officer, and I am sure that the Schley-Hodgson controversy is a most interesting one in the history of the navy.

Now, I ask you to give a palpitating public of which aggression I am an intimate information of the facts of the case. I am sure that you will do so. Who pretends to have heard it? Does Navigating Officer Hodgson say it? Does Admiral Schley deny it? If he does, isn't that sufficient to set upon it the seal of denial? "Does not the reported colloquy, if true, show that you were near enough to them (the Spaniards) to see them?"

"Hodgson—But we will cut down the Texas." "Schley—D—n the Texas! Let her look out for herself."

Putting one thing with another, Hodgson's conduct is a most extraordinary one. He is guilty of quibbling in so doing he admitted afterward on the witness stand.

Hodgson wrote the two following letters, the second explaining very clearly to the writer understood himself as saying by the first:

NAVY YARD, NEW YORK, June 11, 1898. DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: The colloquy published in THE NEW YORK SUN, and which was taken place between you and me on the day of the battle of Santiago July 3, 1898, never occurred.

I return herewith the newspaper clipping containing the colloquy referred to.

NAVY YARD, NEW YORK, June 11, 1898. DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: I send you herewith a copy of the letter of the 8th inst. published in THE NEW YORK SUN, and would ask you to write me your denial of this extract.

In justice to Hodgson it should be said that this colloquy made him out as an engaged, for of course I had never answered you in such manner as appeared in print nor had there been the slightest argument or discussion between us, the very idea of a controversy with a superior officer was to me a thing of which I was proud, and what I desired was to be made a day of the Texas and the probable danger of getting into with her if we turned to starboard, and that you said to me, "I am sure that you will not let the country as well as myself."

Very respectfully, A. C. HODGSON.

It is to be noticed that there is little sign in this letter of the indignation that would be looked for in an officer practically accused of falsehood. The avowed purpose of it was not at all to vindicate the man who was accused, but to vindicate Hodgson, and, according to the letter, to vindicate the party primarily aggrieved. "I desire to place you in a proper light," wrote Schley. The representation should cease, "first, in justice to you."

Hodgson's answer was, briefly, that he could not send a "denial of this extract," for, so far from being a "grotesque lie," it was a true statement, "substantially correct." In his letter there is apparent an inferior mental precision and a moral fervor, but the tone of the case affecting Schley and Hodgson, the letters show, were never confused in Hodgson's mind, nor from his point of view were the assertions of them contradictory. He wrote:

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: ... What THE SUN has printed as part of the conversation between you and me is substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made. He described how, when he heard Schley say "port," he hurried to him with the suggestion that the Texas was in the direction where a port beam would carry the Brooklyn. He told him that he had authorized the use of his name in THE SUN, that "to the best of my recollection, THE SUN's report of the colloquy was substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made."

Here Schley argues that the colloquy could not have been true because Hodgson could not have been an officer and too glib a man to have committed the impropriety of it. He published the first letter of June 11 without the paragraph about the newspaper clipping, which indicated that the denial, instead of being spontaneous, was in response to a request. Hodgson's subsequent statements in his letters and on the witness stand. They showed that he thought he was asked to deny the "verbal accuracy" of the "colloquy as printed," and that, as he admitted on the witness stand, his "denial" was "qualitative."

Now Schley's position is that of a man who feeling himself to be under a serious accusation asks his friend to make a statement to the effect that he is not guilty, but his friend says the charge is substantially true, and refuses to make such a statement. But Schley neither denounces Hodgson for retaining the "qualitative" complaint of not venturing to deny the report himself. Neither did he abandon his efforts on the man he wanted for a witness. He stuck to Hodgson, not with indignation but with argument and renewed protestations of friendship. He wrote:

Other papers are quoted as using terms almost equally severe and slanderous. I think if all these papers were made acquainted with the facts of the case, full and simple apologies would be made for their unjust and abusive language.

Feeling sure that you are not willing that my honor should be for a moment impugned, I write this to ask you to put these facts into the possession of the public. I am sure that you will do so. Who pretends to have heard it? Does Navigating Officer Hodgson say it? Does Admiral Schley deny it? If he does, isn't that sufficient to set upon it the seal of denial? "Does not the reported colloquy, if true, show that you were near enough to them (the Spaniards) to see them?"

Now Schley's position is that of a man who feeling himself to be under a serious accusation asks his friend to make a statement to the effect that he is not guilty, but his friend says the charge is substantially true, and refuses to make such a statement. But Schley neither denounces Hodgson for retaining the "qualitative" complaint of not venturing to deny the report himself. Neither did he abandon his efforts on the man he wanted for a witness. He stuck to Hodgson, not with indignation but with argument and renewed protestations of friendship. He wrote:

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: ... What THE SUN has printed as part of the conversation between you and me is substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made. He described how, when he heard Schley say "port," he hurried to him with the suggestion that the Texas was in the direction where a port beam would carry the Brooklyn. He told him that he had authorized the use of his name in THE SUN, that "to the best of my recollection, THE SUN's report of the colloquy was substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made."

Here Schley argues that the colloquy could not have been true because Hodgson could not have been an officer and too glib a man to have committed the impropriety of it. He published the first letter of June 11 without the paragraph about the newspaper clipping, which indicated that the denial, instead of being spontaneous, was in response to a request. Hodgson's subsequent statements in his letters and on the witness stand. They showed that he thought he was asked to deny the "verbal accuracy" of the "colloquy as printed," and that, as he admitted on the witness stand, his "denial" was "qualitative."

Now Schley's position is that of a man who feeling himself to be under a serious accusation asks his friend to make a statement to the effect that he is not guilty, but his friend says the charge is substantially true, and refuses to make such a statement. But Schley neither denounces Hodgson for retaining the "qualitative" complaint of not venturing to deny the report himself. Neither did he abandon his efforts on the man he wanted for a witness. He stuck to Hodgson, not with indignation but with argument and renewed protestations of friendship. He wrote:

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: ... What THE SUN has printed as part of the conversation between you and me is substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made. He described how, when he heard Schley say "port," he hurried to him with the suggestion that the Texas was in the direction where a port beam would carry the Brooklyn. He told him that he had authorized the use of his name in THE SUN, that "to the best of my recollection, THE SUN's report of the colloquy was substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made."

Here Schley argues that the colloquy could not have been true because Hodgson could not have been an officer and too glib a man to have committed the impropriety of it. He published the first letter of June 11 without the paragraph about the newspaper clipping, which indicated that the denial, instead of being spontaneous, was in response to a request. Hodgson's subsequent statements in his letters and on the witness stand. They showed that he thought he was asked to deny the "verbal accuracy" of the "colloquy as printed," and that, as he admitted on the witness stand, his "denial" was "qualitative."

Now Schley's position is that of a man who feeling himself to be under a serious accusation asks his friend to make a statement to the effect that he is not guilty, but his friend says the charge is substantially true, and refuses to make such a statement. But Schley neither denounces Hodgson for retaining the "qualitative" complaint of not venturing to deny the report himself. Neither did he abandon his efforts on the man he wanted for a witness. He stuck to Hodgson, not with indignation but with argument and renewed protestations of friendship. He wrote:

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: ... What THE SUN has printed as part of the conversation between you and me is substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made. He described how, when he heard Schley say "port," he hurried to him with the suggestion that the Texas was in the direction where a port beam would carry the Brooklyn. He told him that he had authorized the use of his name in THE SUN, that "to the best of my recollection, THE SUN's report of the colloquy was substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made."

Here Schley argues that the colloquy could not have been true because Hodgson could not have been an officer and too glib a man to have committed the impropriety of it. He published the first letter of June 11 without the paragraph about the newspaper clipping, which indicated that the denial, instead of being spontaneous, was in response to a request. Hodgson's subsequent statements in his letters and on the witness stand. They showed that he thought he was asked to deny the "verbal accuracy" of the "colloquy as printed," and that, as he admitted on the witness stand, his "denial" was "qualitative."

Now Schley's position is that of a man who feeling himself to be under a serious accusation asks his friend to make a statement to the effect that he is not guilty, but his friend says the charge is substantially true, and refuses to make such a statement. But Schley neither denounces Hodgson for retaining the "qualitative" complaint of not venturing to deny the report himself. Neither did he abandon his efforts on the man he wanted for a witness. He stuck to Hodgson, not with indignation but with argument and renewed protestations of friendship. He wrote:

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: ... What THE SUN has printed as part of the conversation between you and me is substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made. He described how, when he heard Schley say "port," he hurried to him with the suggestion that the Texas was in the direction where a port beam would carry the Brooklyn. He told him that he had authorized the use of his name in THE SUN, that "to the best of my recollection, THE SUN's report of the colloquy was substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made."

Here Schley argues that the colloquy could not have been true because Hodgson could not have been an officer and too glib a man to have committed the impropriety of it. He published the first letter of June 11 without the paragraph about the newspaper clipping, which indicated that the denial, instead of being spontaneous, was in response to a request. Hodgson's subsequent statements in his letters and on the witness stand. They showed that he thought he was asked to deny the "verbal accuracy" of the "colloquy as printed," and that, as he admitted on the witness stand, his "denial" was "qualitative."

Now Schley's position is that of a man who feeling himself to be under a serious accusation asks his friend to make a statement to the effect that he is not guilty, but his friend says the charge is substantially true, and refuses to make such a statement. But Schley neither denounces Hodgson for retaining the "qualitative" complaint of not venturing to deny the report himself. Neither did he abandon his efforts on the man he wanted for a witness. He stuck to Hodgson, not with indignation but with argument and renewed protestations of friendship. He wrote:

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: ... What THE SUN has printed as part of the conversation between you and me is substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made. He described how, when he heard Schley say "port," he hurried to him with the suggestion that the Texas was in the direction where a port beam would carry the Brooklyn. He told him that he had authorized the use of his name in THE SUN, that "to the best of my recollection, THE SUN's report of the colloquy was substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made."

Here Schley argues that the colloquy could not have been true because Hodgson could not have been an officer and too glib a man to have committed the impropriety of it. He published the first letter of June 11 without the paragraph about the newspaper clipping, which indicated that the denial, instead of being spontaneous, was in response to a request. Hodgson's subsequent statements in his letters and on the witness stand. They showed that he thought he was asked to deny the "verbal accuracy" of the "colloquy as printed," and that, as he admitted on the witness stand, his "denial" was "qualitative."

Now Schley's position is that of a man who feeling himself to be under a serious accusation asks his friend to make a statement to the effect that he is not guilty, but his friend says the charge is substantially true, and refuses to make such a statement. But Schley neither denounces Hodgson for retaining the "qualitative" complaint of not venturing to deny the report himself. Neither did he abandon his efforts on the man he wanted for a witness. He stuck to Hodgson, not with indignation but with argument and renewed protestations of friendship. He wrote:

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: ... What THE SUN has printed as part of the conversation between you and me is substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made. He described how, when he heard Schley say "port," he hurried to him with the suggestion that the Texas was in the direction where a port beam would carry the Brooklyn. He told him that he had authorized the use of his name in THE SUN, that "to the best of my recollection, THE SUN's report of the colloquy was substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made."

Here Schley argues that the colloquy could not have been true because Hodgson could not have been an officer and too glib a man to have committed the impropriety of it. He published the first letter of June 11 without the paragraph about the newspaper clipping, which indicated that the denial, instead of being spontaneous, was in response to a request. Hodgson's subsequent statements in his letters and on the witness stand. They showed that he thought he was asked to deny the "verbal accuracy" of the "colloquy as printed," and that, as he admitted on the witness stand, his "denial" was "qualitative."

Now Schley's position is that of a man who feeling himself to be under a serious accusation asks his friend to make a statement to the effect that he is not guilty, but his friend says the charge is substantially true, and refuses to make such a statement. But Schley neither denounces Hodgson for retaining the "qualitative" complaint of not venturing to deny the report himself. Neither did he abandon his efforts on the man he wanted for a witness. He stuck to Hodgson, not with indignation but with argument and renewed protestations of friendship. He wrote:

DEAR ADMIRAL SCHLEY: ... What THE SUN has printed as part of the conversation between you and me is substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made. He described how, when he heard Schley say "port," he hurried to him with the suggestion that the Texas was in the direction where a port beam would carry the Brooklyn. He told him that he had authorized the use of his name in THE SUN, that "to the best of my recollection, THE SUN's report of the colloquy was substantially correct, though not as to the manner in which the reply was made."

Here Schley argues that the colloquy could not have been true because Hodgson could not have been an officer and too glib a man to have committed the impropriety of it. He published the first letter of June 11 without the paragraph about the newspaper clipping, which indicated that the denial, instead of being spontaneous, was in response to a request. Hodgson's subsequent statements in his letters and on the witness stand. They showed that he thought he was asked to deny the "verbal accuracy" of the "colloquy as printed," and that, as he admitted on the witness stand, his "denial" was "qualitative."

## ROCKEFELLER RESEARCH PLAN

## 19 STUDENTS TO WORK IN LABORATORIES THIS WINTER.

Tuberculosis and Typhoid Fever the Diseases to Be Studied—Under the Fellowships Established—One Worker to Experiment in Germany.

Plans for the work to be taken up this winter by the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research which was founded several months ago by John D. Rockefeller, a plan to begin work with \$100,000, were considered by the Board of Directors at a meeting held Saturday evening in this city, and at which all of the men whom Mr. Rockefeller selected to manage the institution were present. The board consists of Dr. William H. Welch of Baltimore, President; Dr. Herman M. Biggs, Dr. Christian Herter, Treasurer, and Dr. Ernest Holt, Secretary, all of this city, and Dr. Theobald Smith of Boston and Dr. Simon Flexner of Philadelphia.

It was the second quarterly meeting to be held since the founding of the institute. At it, according to Dr. Holt, who was authorized to give out an outline of the plans decided upon, it was decided to begin the work of research in earnest this winter, and to that end nineteen fellowships were established.

The persons having these fellowships will work in laboratories in Chicago, Montreal, Philadelphia, Ann Arbor, Boston, Baltimore and other cities. Only one is to work abroad and the person to do this has already been selected and is on his way to his new field of labor which will be in Prof. Ehrlich's laboratory in Germany. This worker is Dr. Marshall, a pupil of Dr. Welch's. Names of the others who will engage in the work of research have not yet been given out, as only a few have been selected.

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."

As to the American Federation of Labor, the report says that the representation in the conventions of that body, the basis for calculation, does not accurately represent the membership of the Federation. "The Federation," it says, "has tended year by year to embrace an increasing proportion of the American unions, so that its growth has been somewhat greater than the growth of unionism as a whole. Yet, while not showing even approximately the absolute membership of the American unions, the figures may give some indication of the direction and the velocity of movement. The number of members apparently represented in the Federation, from 1900 to 1901, was about 200,000 in 1900 and 1901 to nearly 250,000 in 1901, fell sharply to about 175,000 in 1902, then rose gradually to about 200,000 in 1903, and went up to 225,000 in 1904, and went up to 250,000 in 1905, and to more than 300,000 in 1906."